DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 191 572 PS 011 670

AUTHOR Lambert, Sandi; And Others
TITLE The Validation of Local Title I, ESEA Projects in Massachusetts, 1978-1979.
INSTITUTION Massachusetts State Dept. of Education, Boston. Massachusetts Dissemination Project.
SPONS AGENCY Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C. Div. of Compensatory Education.
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 55p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Check Lists; *Information Dissemination; *Program Development; Program Effectiveness; *Program Implementation; *Program Validation; Questionnaires
IDENTIFIERS *Title I

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this report, presented in five sections, is to provide readers with a general orientation to the Massachusetts Title I Validation Process. Section I responds to some of the most frequently asked questions about validation. Section II describes how and why the validation process originated, outlines other established validation processes, gives an underlying basis for this practice, cites some of the perceived benefits of validation and concludes with a summary of some of the noticeable features of validated programs. Section III provides a chronological synopsis of the development and implementation of the Massachusetts Title I validation process. This section is intended to both acquaint the reader with the original procedures advanced by the state office during the 1979 school year, and to provide a frame of reference for project directors who may wish to pursue validation in the future. Some of the issues surrounding the development of a state's process for validating projects funded under Title I are described in Section IV and the dissemination of state validated practices and the future implementation of the process are discussed in Section V. (Author/MP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED191572

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

The Validation of Local Title I, ESEA Projects in Massachusetts

1978-1979

PS011670

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
Foreword		ii
Acknowledgments		iii
SECTION I	Some Frequently Asked Questions on Validation and Dissemination	1
SECTION II	Overview of Educational Validation: Practices and Issues	3
SECTION III	Stages in the Development and Implementation of the Massachusetts Title I Validation Process	14
SECTION IV	Special Considerations	20
SECTION V	Transferring Success and Future Implications	23

APPENDICES

A.	Cognitive Impact Verification (Form A) outline and sample page	25
B.	Cognitive Impact Verification (Form B) outline and sample page	28
C.	Project Description Report - outline	31
D.	Observable Project Features Worksheet	33
E.	Parent Involvement Checklist - outline	35
F.	Parent Advisory Council Validation Interview Worksheet	38
G.	Sample Format for the Validation Report	40
H.	Massachusetts Validated Title I Projects, 1979	41
I.	Massachusetts Validated Title I Parent Advisory Councils, 1979	42
J.	Members of the Massachusetts Dissemination Advisory Council	43
K.	Members of the Parents Subcommittee who Helped Develop the Parent Involvement Checklist	44
L.	On-Site Validation Team Members	45

BIBLIOGRAPHY 49

Foreword

The purpose of this report is to provide readers with a general orientation to the Massachusetts Title I Validation Process.

There are five sections to this report. The first section responds to some of the most frequently asked questions about validation. Section two is a narrative, it describes how and why the validation process originated. It outlines other established validation processes, gives an underlying basis for this practice, cites some of the perceived benefits of validation and concludes with a summary of some of the noticeable features of validated programs. Section three provides a chronological synopsis of the development and implementation of the Massachusetts Title I validation process. This section is intended to acquaint the reader with the original procedures advanced by the state office during the 1979 school year. *Section three also aims to provide a frame of reference for project directors who may wish to pursue validation in the future. It should be noted, however, that as a result of subsequent refinements, the Title I validation procedures described in this informational report are not necessarily those required by the state Title I office to apply for and achieve validation. The reporting of such validation procedures and requirements will be issued from the Massachusetts Department of Education Title I office by the Title I Evaluation Specialist.*

In section four, some of the issues surrounding the development of a state's process for validating projects funded under Title I are described. And, finally, section five duscusses the dissemination of state validated practices and the future implementation of the process.

Acknowledgements

This report was prepared by Sandi Lambert, project director, Title I Dissemination Project, Dr. Allen Schenck, senior research associate, Title I Technical Assistance Center, and Dr. Richard Zusman, state Title I evaluation specialist.

In addition, valuable assistance in carrying out the validation procedure came from Mr. Joaquim Baptista, state Title I director and his staff.

Section I

Some Frequently Asked Questions on Validation and Dissemination

Q. What is validation?

A. Validation is a process by which a Title I project demonstrates, through the collection and presentation of sufficient evidence its credibility as an exemplary of effective project. By definition, Validation requires verification through the review of statistical and other significant, demonstrable evidence of a Title I project's educational effectiveness. A project undergoes validation to obtain the state Education Department's endorsement of the exemplariness of its educational practices or products.

Q. What is meant by "evidence"?

A. For the purposes of validating educational practices or products there must be observable phenomena or documentation indicating or furnishing proof that such practices or products have accomplished their stated objectives.

Q. What is an "exemplary practice"?

A. An exemplary practice is one which can serve as a model for other educators, because of its excellence in achievements.

Q. What is the purpose of validation?

A. To identify essentially good, workable and exemplary educational practices and to promote their adoption by other school districts.

Q. What kind of project should be considered for validation?

A. A Title I project which is in complete compliance and (A) can be characterized by practices or products which are unique and successful or (B) exhibits some technique or format which is effective and (C) can provide accurate, convincing and reliable documentation of effectiveness.

Q. Who is involved in the validation process?
A. The process is a cooperative one involving activities and contributions by district and project personnel, state Education Department and technical assistance center personnel, impartial evaluators and other technical reviewers.

Q. Who is responsible for managing the validation process?
A. The Massachusetts Title I Process is administered by the Title I Office of the state Department of Education.

Q. How long does validation take?
A. About two days to prepare and submit the necessary paper work and one-two days for an on-site review by a validation team.

Q. Who composes the on-site validation team?
A. The team is led by the state's Educational Specialist and assisted by an external evaluation consultant, a curriculum expert and sometimes a local Title I director.

Q. Who certifies that a program is validated?
A. Although the validation team must recommend a project for validation, it is the state Title I Coordinator who finally endorses the program for statewide validation.

Q. What is dissemination?
A. Validation is a concept which is intended to be a quality control mechanism for assisting school districts in selecting successful programs and or products to meet local needs. (Validation provides evidence that specific practices in the educational system can be achieved under stipulated conditions.) Dissemination provides decision-makers with relevant and sufficient information with which they can adapt or adopt these successful models. By definition, dissemination is a two- or multi-way sharing process for communicating educational needs, problems, solutions and information among educational practitioners, decision-makers and recipients of educational services.

Q. Do validation and dissemination activities make a difference?
A. Validation and dissemination practices in education are, in a general sense, exercises that are as experiential as they are rewarding in their generation of meaningful evidence that improves the education process. These activities promote a more confident and effective approach to communication between research and development and practitioners in the educational system.

Section II

Overview of Educational Validation: Practices and Issues

In the past decade, the federal government has spent a lot of money on the development of programs designed to improve the quality of education in the United States.

For example, education laboratories and centers authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) have produced hundreds of programs and practices. Title III of this act (Now Title IV, Part C) has provided funds for the development of thousands of innovative programs at the local school level. New reading and math programs for disadvantaged children have been generated with Title I funds. Model programs for educating learning disabled children, authorized by Title VI-G, have evolved to the point where they can now be offered to schools for adoption. Years of federal funding for bilingual education (Title VI) has given rise to hundreds of programs in this area. And, under the Higher Education Act of 1965, Teacher Corps has stimulated the development of programs and practices in such areas as multi-cultural education, community-school relationships, and in-services training for teachers.

The Education Division of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) has placed a great deal of emphasis on moving these new programs from the labs and centers and school development sites into other schools that need them. The start-up costs associated are high. Also, it is believed that there has been a lot of duplication of effort in developing programs to address specific needs. If school systems indeed do share problems and priorities, careful dissemination of effective products and practices seems appropriate.

But how does one determine whether or not a product, program or practice is effective? The fact that the U.S. Office of Education or the National Institute of Education pays for the development of these programs does not automatically insure that they will be effective, workable, or affordable. The assistance, monitoring and evaluation efforts of the funding agencies during the projects' developmental phases can aid them in moving toward successful outcomes. Still, some programs attain their goals, others do not; and the problem is how to distinguish the effective programs from the rest.

Making this kind of judgement is complicated by a sense of ownership that arises in federal or state program personnel after guiding an educational program through its developmental phase. One becomes associated with a program professionally and is more likely to advance claims about its effectiveness that are founded as much on a familiarity with its features and its staff as they are upon the results of a rigorous evaluation.

In order to promote the identification, dissemination and diffusion of effective education programs, products and practices, the Education Division of HEW has created and is currently supporting three separate processes: the Joint Dissemination Review Panel, the National Diffusion Network, and the Identification, Validation and Dissemination (IVD) process. Each of these processes is believed to contribute to the identification of products and practices that work and make it possible for local school systems to find out about them and to adopt or adapt them.

The Joint Dissemination Review Panel

In 1972, the Education Division of HEW established a new policy on dissemination. Before the Division could take a position of advocacy in the dissemination of an educational product or practice for which claims of effectiveness were made, the evidence supporting these claims would have to be judged to be convincing by a panel chosen from within the Division. If this evidence of effectiveness was found to be persuasive, then the product or practice could receive Education Division support for widespread use. The Division was interested in disseminating effective educational products and practices and it was willing to assume the responsibility to review the evidence of effectiveness claimed for the product or practice before allowing federal support for its dissemination.

Although a dissemination review process was originally conceived by the Education Division as a joint USOE-NIE activity, the agencies initially established separate procedures. In 1973, the Dissemination Review Panel (DPP) was formed within the Office of Education, composed of nine high-level USOE program officers. Its basic function was to review claims of effectiveness presented by program officers from USOE on behalf of programs that were developed under their guidance.

In 1975, the Education Division combined the two processes into the Joint Dissemination Review Panel (JDRP), a 22-member body comprising equal membership from USOE and NIE. Its function was continued as originally conceived--to assess the adequacy of effectiveness data supporting a product or practice--now including those products and practices developed with support from either agency.

Members of the JDRP are nominated by the Commissioner of Education and the Director of NIE from among their staffs on the basis of their qualifications in evaluation and social science methodology, the programs they represent (to achieve broad program representation within the JDRP), and their position within their agency.

Since the JDRP is a group that serves only the Education Division, it is the responsibility of program officers in USOE and NIE to identify educational products and practices they believe to be worthy of dissemination and to submit these to the JDRP for validation. The director of a federally-funded project, which has developed a product or practice, may not apply directly to the JDRP.

Although the program officer submits the application, the project whose product or practice is to be reviewed by the JDRP usually prepares the application according to guidelines published by the panel. In some cases, preparing the application is a joint effort of the USOE or NIE program officer and project personnel. The maximum permissible length of the written submission is 10 single-spaced typed pages, including tables.

The program officer conducts a pre-review of the application for factual accuracy, consistency and completeness, compliance with program regulations, social fairness, and the absence of any other criteria such as quality of development, user enthusiasm, and conceptual soundness to decide whether to submit the application to the JDRP. Some program offices have established an internal review process to make a preliminary assessment of the adequacy of the evaluation design and results as presented in the application. The written information provided to the Panel thus reflects the combined knowledge of the program officer (regarding Panel expectations) and the project personnel (concerning the product or practice and its effectiveness).

Normally, when at least three applications are pending, the chairman calls a meeting of the Panel, allowing at least five working days for the members to reveiw each application.

The JDRP asks the NIE or USOE program officer, who is sponsoring the product or practice, to appear at the meeting to answer questions and clarify points that may be inadequately presented in the application. The director of the project which developed the product or practice under review, the evaluator who assisted in developing the evidence of its effectiveness, and any member of the project staff may accompany the program officer to the meeting, and may participate in the proceedings if called upon. The panel will not entertain any material not included in the 10 page submission.

Seven members of the JDRP, with at least three from each agency, constitute a quorum. Voting is by closed ballot, although each member's vote is announced and recorded in the minutes. A simple majority of those members present decides the issue.

All meetings are open to the public, and all records--the application, the minutes of the meeting, the decision on the application, including reasons for disapproval--are public records, open to inspection. Some project directors have found it advantageous to attend a panel meeting in which other submissions are being reviewed so they can gain an understanding of the kind of evidence and the form of presentation that seems most persuasive.

It appears that several questions guide the deliberations of the panel during its review:

* Is there sufficient evidence that something happened that is consistent with the claims made by the product or practice's developers?

* Are these outcomes educationally important or significant?

* Can these outcomes be attributed to the product or practice?

* Are the outcomes generalizable to settings other than that in which the product or practice was developed?

* Are the costs of using the product or practice reasonable?

Given the nature of these questions, one can see that it is not possible to specify precisely what kinds of evidence differentiate acceptable from unacceptable submissions. The review provided by the panel is subjective to a degree and, therefore, is dependent upon the background, experience, and orientation of its members.

This dependency is, perhaps, the reason why there is concern on the part of developers of products and practices which do not fit directly into the mainstream of innovative educational program development. Programs in compensatory education, environmental education, reading, mathematics, bilingual education, and other similar areas are usually determined through traditional and well-understood, if not always fool-proof, evaluation designs. However, there are many educational activities supported by the Education Division which are not directly measurable with student achievement outcomes.

Instead, they seek to change attitudes or impart information. Others are aimed at bringing about changes in institutional procedures, persuading state and local governments to adopt certain techniques, or altering the ways in which state or local monies are spent. Still others seek to expand the pool of competent educational practitioners through innovations in in-service or pre-service training. In all of these cases, quite different outcome measures and evidence of effectiveness will be required. Other, less-traditional evaluation designs may be needed.

If a product or practice receives a favorable review from the JDRP, it is eligible to receive federal support for dissemination. At a minimum, this involves being listed and described in a publication, Educational Programs That Work. If the submission to the panel is rejected, the program officer sponsoring the product or practice may resubmit an application for approval at any time thereafter.

The National Diffusion Network

The National Diffusion Network (NDN) is a program of USOE. It was launched in 1974 under ESEA Title III as one of the first comprehensive national efforts for moving educational programs from the original development site to schools nationwide where the programs could be used. It represented a federal initiative to spread the programmatic results of millions of federal, elementary and secondary education dollars to new settings at a fraction of their developmental costs.

Two types of projects constitute the NDN: State Facilitator projects and Developer-Demonstrator projects. A Developer-Demonstrator project receives funds from USOE for the purpose of introducing its product or practice to educators and, if a school system elects to install it, for the purpose of training school staff in how to use the product or practice.

However, before a project can attain Developer-Demonstrator status, it must meet two conditions. First, its product or practice must have been approved by the JDRP. Secondly, it must present a proposal for disseminating its product or practice that merits federal support. Because funds are limited, USOE cannot grant Developer-Demonstrator status to all projects whose products and practices have been approved by the JDRP and it, therefore, must choose those projects whose products and practices meet a pressing national education need and whose dissemination plans are sound.

A State Facilitator project is the linking agent between the Developer-Demonstrator projects and the local school district. It informs school districts about the existence of Developer-Demonstrator projects whose products and practices can be adopted or adapted; it also helps school districts match their needs with products and practices available; it arranges for demonstrations and staff training if a school elects to adopt or adapt the product or practice; and, in many cases, it provides ongoing technical assistance during the first few months to those adopting or adapting school systems.

IVD - A State Validation Program

The JDRP is an internal quality control mechanism for the Education Division of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. It serves program officers in NIE and USOE who must make decisions about which educational products and practices, developed under those funding sources, to disseminate nationally. Its judgements are not intended to affect validation and/or dissemination programs of state or local education agencies.

Still, most state education agencies confront the same question: which educational products and practices developed within their borders are effective and, therefore, are worth disseminating to local school districts?

At the time the JDRP was first organized, the Division of Supplementary Centers and Services in USOE (administrators of ESEA Title III throughout its history) was encouraging state education agencies to use the IVD process (Identification, Validation, Dissemination) for identifying effective Title III projects within their borders whose products and practices local schools could adopt.

The IVD process was developed by the Education Division in collaboration with state education agencies. It calls for a team of evaluators to conduct an on-site validation of a local project, rendering a judgement about its effectiveness based on what they see there and on data supplied in an extensive IVD application form. It should be noted that school district participation is voluntary. Unlike the JDRP procedure, IVD provides an in-depth, on-site look at an educational project's products or practices and their effectiveness. The validation team examines project evaluation information and other documentation, and interviews project staff to assess the project's success in terms of three criteria: impact on students, cost-effectiveness, ans exportability to other school districts.

Although the IVD process is jointly sponsored by USOE and state departments of education, the decision to employ the IVD process for identifying effective projects remains with the state education agency. Most states are employing the IVD process, or an adaptation of it, as their own internal quality control mechanism. Projects which are successful in receiving IVD validation are often eligible to apply for state funding to disseminate their validated products or practices within their borders, and many states offer support to school districts adopting IVD-validated products and practices. The USOE role in the IVD process continues primarily as the sponsor of the training for validation team members.

The IVD and JDRP processes can complement one another in providing avenues for effective educational products and practices to achieve statewide and national visibility and support. Many of the products and practices validated by the JDRP were developed by projects previously successful in the IVD review process, which better prepared them to pass JDRP scrutiny. (It should be noted, however, that the two procedures are independent, and one is not a prerequisite of the other.)

A Comparison of the Characteristics of the
Joint Dissemination Review Panel (JDRP) and
The Identification, Validation, Dissemination (IVD) Processes

JDRP	IVD
* Internal quality control for United States Office of Education/National Institute of Education	* Internal quality control by the State Department of Education
* Application is brief (10 pages)	* Application is lengthy
* Minimum size of panel is seven, out of 10 representatives	* On-site validation teams typically contain three or four members
* Criteria for approval focused upon impact of product/practice	* Criteria for approval focused upon impact, costs and exportability
* Successful review permits national dissemination through NDN	* Successful review permits statewide dissemination
* "Validation" does <u>not</u> include formal process for verifying effectiveness claims	* Validation does include formal process for verifying effectiveness claims

* Neither process is contingent upon successful completion of the other

Benefits Derived from Validation

1. Local school systems have access to a large pool of products and practices which have been shown to work. They can adopt or adapt these products and practices to address their needs at a cost much lower than what is required to develop their own.

2. The current validation-dissemination processes available provide a useful and effective alternative to literature searches through learned journals and practitioner-oriented publications.

3. The dissemination of educational products and practices that are essentially worthless and, perhaps, harmful is controlled, if not prevented.

4. National education priorities can be addressed through JDRP/NDN. The priorities of SEA's can be addressed through a state designed or IVD process if the JDRP/NDN process does not seem to be providing products and practices that address their priorities.

5. The quality of evaluation theory, methodology, and practice in the development of educational products and practices will improve.

6. Constructive changes in teaching practices can be stimulated from within the local school system through the adoption or adaptation of products and practices that have been demonstrated to work elsewhere.

7. The process of preparing for validation provides project personnel with a better understanding of their goals, objectives, and activities.

8. In a time of fiscal accountability, a local school board has justificaiton to support and continue a program that has been validated.

Benefits Derived from Validation (Continued)

9. Achieving validation establishes the educational worth of the program and brings positive attention to the project within its own community as well as within its state and the nation.

10. Approval by JDRP or IVD can lead to additional funding for dissemination activities.

11. Professional advancement to those individuals who have been exposed to the total validation/dissemination process is enhanced.

12. Further improvement and refinement of the practice(s) in the project undergoing validaiton is encouraged.

13. Validation provides the project additional means of analyzing the success of its program beyond the project evaluation.

14. The project learns more about its needs, activities, successes, and cost effectiveness as a result of validation.

15. The state Title I office will be in a position to accumulate worthwhile evaluative information about programs and practices that will stimulate previously unconfirmed opinions. In turn, department personnel will have a broadened operational base from which to make recommendations to other programs.

Some Noticeable Features of Validated Programs

* They have project directors who display keen management and administrative techniques.

* They are in localities whose community groups and parents participate, to great degrees, in the planning of the projects and in many of their own activities.

* They keep extensive records and are well equipped to document their findings.

* They are creative in nature and purpose and the projects' staffs are usually quite resourceful.

* They are functioning in school districts whose administrators and school boards, as well as the communities at large, are substantially committed to the projects and practices and are highly motivated to see them continued with local resources.

* They are meeting basic educational needs and thereby, have solved and continue to solve some common educational problems [1]

[1] Transferring Successful Practices, Albany, NY, p. 14

Section III

Stages in the Development and Implementation of the Massachusetts Title I Validation Process

The Title I office in the Massachusetts Department of Education, in cooperation with the Title I Dissemination Project, the Title I Technical Assistance Center, the Massachusetts Dissemination Advisory Council* and the state Title I Parent Advisory Council set about in the fall of 1978 to strengthen the evaluation and dissemination of exemplary practices in Title I projects. Representatives from each of these agencies met regularly over a six month period to design a process which would identify Title I practices having a direct and measurable impact on student achievement in reading, math and language arts, grades 2-12. Consistent with the tradition of parent involvement in Title I, this group also initiated the design of a validation process to evaluate the effectiveness of Title I Parent Advisory Councils.

The development of these processes began with a preliminary request to the state's education specialists, who supervise local Title I projects, to identify programs or program components including Title I Parent Advisory Councils who appeared to be explenary. Fifty-three programs and/or components including eleven Parent Advisory Councils were so identified and recommended for validation.

The annual reports for each of these projects were then obtained for review by a pre-screening committee. This committee was composed of impartial evaluation specialists. The purpose of this examination of documentation was to select those instructional programs (or instructional components) which demonstrated evidence of a cognitive impact on students in reading, math or language arts, grades 2-12. (The selection of parent councils was set aside for later review.)

This "screening phase" consisted of three steps. The first step was to determine from the annual evaluation reports which projects reported greater than "normal" cognitive growth in reading, math and/or language arts in at least 75 percent of the grades for which such data were reported. Normal growth was defined as either (a) no change in the percentile of the average test score from pre- to post-testing, or (b) an increase in the grade equivalent of the average test from pre- to post-testing that was greater than the number of months between pre- and post-testing. Percentile increases were reviewed whenever possible. Thirteen programs did not meet this first criterion.

* see appendix J for a full list of the members of this council

The second step consisted of determining which of the forty remaining programs reported greater than normal growth based upon at least ten students per grade in at least 75 percent of the grades for which data were reported. Five more programs did not meet this criterion. These programs were "set aside" for further consideration. Although their reported cognitive impacts were based on very small numbers of students, it was felt that one or more of them might be selected for an on-site visit to assure representation of small programs in the validation process.

Another criterion which was employed in the pre-screening process was the requirement that at least two-thirds of the program occurred between pre- and post-testing. No additional programs were eliminated for this reason.

The third step in the pre-screening process was to assign each program to one of three groups based upon the overall size of its reported cognitive gains. These groups were called large, medium and small. The programs with large gains typically reported increases in excess of ten percentile points or two grade equivalent months per month in the program. The medium group typically reported increases of 5-10 percentile points or 1.5 grade equivalent months per month in the program. The small gains were usually between 1-4 percentile points or just slightly more than one grade equivalent month per month in the program.

Instruments were developed to document information concerning program impact and program description. The Cognitive Impact Verification Form was developed with the assistance of the Technical Assistance Center to provide evidence that the observed cognitive impact was based on adequate and accurate evaluation, testing and data analysis procedures. The Defining and Describing Project Features Title I form was developed with the assistance of the Dissemination Advisory Council and the Massachusetts State Facilitator to provide an analysis and description of the essential elements which comprise the Title I program.

Two versions of each instrument were prepared. One version was mailed to the Title I program seeking validation, to be completed by that program's staff prior to the on-site validation team's visit. The second version of each was to be completed by the on-site team during or shortly after the validation team's visit.

Shortly after this pre-screening phase, a training session was held for potential on-site validation team members. During this meeting, the development of the validation process was described. In addition, the role and responsibilities of the teams were discussed, and the data collection instruments were explained. At the end of this session, each team worked out a tentative schedule for making visits to each Title I program that qualified for a validation visit based on the pre-screening review.

The validation team was formed with the cooperation of the Right to Read Program and curriculum specialists in public schools throughout the state. The teams included as many as four and no less than three persons. A team was composed of (1) the education specialist who supervised the qualifying program - this team member acted as the facilitator of activities and prepared the validation team report; (2) curriculum specialists relative to each qualifying instructional component; (3) a Title I project director not associated with the qualifying program; and (4) an evaluation specialist also not associated with the qualifying program.

Members of both the teams and pre-screening committee were volunteers. Individuals were invited to participate because of their experience and expertise in a particular discipline and/or evaluation techniques.

The purpose of the one day site visit was to collect additional details concerning (A) evidence of the impact of the program and (B) essential elements which define the nature of the program. Based on this, the team had to recommend or not recommend the program for validation. The team was asked for a consensus opinion.

Following the site visit, validation materials were collected by the education specialist. These were summarized into a two page Validation Report. This and all other validation documents were forwarded to the Title I Dissemination Advisory Council for submission to the state Title I office.

If the program was recommended for validation, the Title I Dissemination Advisory Council reviewed all of the evidence gathered by the team. If the evidence for validation was conclusive, the Council submitted the Validation Report to the Title I state office. The project was then certified by the state Title I office. The Council reviewed the thirteen programs visited by the validation teams, all were forwarded to the state office and all thirteen were recognized as validated.

Upon validation, the superintendent of the school district, the PAC chairperson, the project director, the education specialist, and the coordinator of the State's Regional Office received a letter of announcement from the Associate Commissioner of the Curriculum and Instruction Division that the program had achieved validation. A description of each validated program was published and distributed throughout the state, and at the invitation of the state office each validated project gave an awareness presentation at the 1979 Annual Title I Conference. Finally, at least five of the thirteen validated programs are currently preparing submissions for national validation through the Joint Dissemination Review Panel.

The approach taken to develop a process for validating Title I Parent Advisory Councils was similar to that taken for Title I programs. Keeping in mind that the parent advisory component of a Title I project has not one but many aspects, a committee composed of parent council members, parent coordinators, project directors, evaluators and dissemination specialists designed a data collection instrument that would assess several phases of parent activity in a local Title I program.

The Parent Involvement Checklist was organized to identify the effectiveness of councils at the district and local school level. The checklist served as a pre-screening mechanism. It was sent to the eleven recommended parent councils. Given the constraints of development, the possibility of eleven submissions was viewed as a manageable number, however, only four chose to complete the process.

Parent Council Chairpersons were asked to meet with their membership to complete the checklist and return the document with sample evidence relating to specific inquiries.

The checklist collected data on such things as:

(1) Evidence that school advisory council subcommittees (e.g., membership, budget, evaluation) were formed.

(2) Evidence that the District Advisory Council is active in making decisions about the program.

(3) Evidence that decisions made by the councils are being carried out and are having an impact on the schools.

The nominated Parent Advisory Council submitted samples of subcommittee rosters; subcommittee reports read into the minutes of meetings; and correspondence to and from program administrators that illustrated a cooperative relationship in resolving issues.

Upon receipt of the checklist and supporting documentation, a screening committee carefully reviewed the materials looking for consistent evidence that parents were involved in the Title I program. If such evidence was present, a one day on-site validation visit was scheduled.

For this component, the validation teams consisted of a local parent council member, a state parent council member, a parent coordinator and a Title I project director. Teams composed of at least three members made an on-site visit.

The validation team members were given a one day training session. They reviewed the material submitted by the council they would visit. From this review, each team generated a number of questions which would amplify or clarify the materials and which would verify the claim of effectiveness.

A validation team chai-person was designated for each team. This individual was responsible for coordinating the visit and preparing a two page "Validation Report." The team could, by consensus, either recommend or reject the nomination for validation.

Again, all validation materials were submitted to the Title I Dissemination Advisory Council. The council reviewed four sets of documentation and forwarded four Validation Reports to the state Title I office for "certification." All four were recognized as validated.

The final stages of validation for Title I Parent Advisory Councils were identical to those for Title I programs. In addition, at least two of the validated Parent Advisory Councils indicated a desire to seek national validation through the Joint Dissemination Review Panel.

The On-Site Validation Team Visit

The purpose of the visitation was to examine and verify the data and other information that was presented by the project or Parent Advisory Council undergoing validation.

These are some of the tasks assigned to the team:

(1) Attend a one day training session to gain familiarity with the validation instruments, to review a description of the nominated projects, to get agreement on an agenda or schedule of interviews and observations.

(2) Organize itself and make arrangements among its membership to undertake its duties and responsibilities.

(3) Examine and/or recheck all evaluative data.

(4) Conduct any necessary interviews of pupils, teachers, administrators, parents and others associated with the project.

(5) Observe the use of facilities of the program or practice.

(6) Complete the validation worksheets that were prepared for the team's use and which were to be used in the generation of the Validation Report.*

(7) Hold a "team session" at the end of the visitation to assess the findings and to collectively recommend* or reject the project's bid for validation.

* The team's decision, pertinent observations, and recommendations were all represented in the report. The recommendation or rejection was duly signed by each member of the team before it was submitted.

Section IV

Special Considerations

It can be said that the Joint Dissemination Review Panel plays a very important role in the practice of educational validation and dissemination. This role, however, reflects the needs and priorities of the U.S. Office of Education and the National Institute of Education. Thus, in order to be responsive to the unique needs and priorities of educational systems within their boundaries, many states implement their own procedures.

For example, during the past several years the Massachusetts Department of Education, Title IV-C Office has been developing a validation process for educational projects, products and practices that seek statewide dissemination. Projects funded under Title I, ESEA may use this process. They may also seek validation through the Joint Dissemination Review Panel. These processes are not heirarchical. Project Understand, a Title I program in Arlington, Massachusetts, succeeded in obtaining validation in 1974 through the Joint Dissemination Review Panel. In fact, projects and practices that are properly developed and operated and whose activities are carefully monitored, evaluated and documented, usually have the best chances of achieving validation through whichever agency they apply.

Title I projects, however, operate under a specific set of regulations concerning supplanting, comparability, maintenance of effort, services to non-public schools and appropriate evaluation models. Because of the concern with aspects such as these, the state Title I office chose to design a process which addressed these characteristics. The Joint Dissemination Review Panel, the Identification, Validation and Dissemination, and the Title IV-C validation manuals provided the guidance and the direction necessary to design and implement a statewide process. The department adopted and adapted much from these processes. The distinct differences are that its own design focused on pertinent state and federal requirements, as well as program effectiveness and innovation. As a result, Title I project directors in Massachusetts are assured that programs validated by the state Title I office function successfully and are models of compliance.

During the stages of screening, it was decided by the initiators of this process that kindergarten and preschool programs would be omitted because of unresolved issues in measurement and evaluation design for this grade span. Secondary Title I programs were also omitted. In this case, there was insufficient data available for review. These programs are relatively new to the system (one-two years in operation).

In addition to the considerations previously cited, a third aspect which merits reporting in this section is the short-term goal established by the validation developers. This goal was to organize the precedural details of validation in time to allow projects to undergo validation for possible dissemination at the 1979 Annual Title I Conference.

In order to do this, time became a real factor. There was a need for much planning, careful application to significant details and substantive involvement by the state and local school districts. For these reasons the thirteen projects selected for visitation by validation teams were those which (1) reported the highest academic gains during the pre-screening process, (2) were willing to prepare the paperwork and organize a substantial amount of evidence for an on-site visit and (3) were willing to conduct an awareness presentation at the Annual Title I Conference.

Other projects which at this time qualified for an on-site visit but did not meet the objectives above agreed to pursue validation during the 1980 school year.

It is important to mention that the installation of the Title I validation process could not have been achieved without the truly cooperative nature of the one hundred or so individuals who were involved.

Some of these "special considerations" just described are modest, others more substantial. Attention to such details, however, allowed the initiators to address the implied and often expressed need of local project directors who were unable, and perhaps unwilling to investigate programs validated by other processes.

In sum, the attention given the regulatory issues and the effort to install the validation process for dissemination at the annual conference sought, at that time, to engender confidence in the educational enterprise of the state.

Another matter of significance in the development of the Title I validation process was the state Title I office's desire to consider the validation of Title I Parent Advisory Councils. To date, neither the Joint Dissemination Review Panel nor any IVD process has validated an advisory council as a single component. Traditionally, these processes only consider program components for validation which demonstrate a positive impact on student achievement. Despite all the research, there were no valid and reliable instruments to measure the impact of parent involvement on student achievement.

The prevailing issue is, however, that involving parents in the activities of the public school, especially in compensatory education programs, remains philosophically sound. In addition, there has been a legislative commitment which not only requires the formation of parent advisory councils but also requires educational agencies to provide mechanisms for their viability and maintenance. There is a growing awareness that:

(1) There are activities which parents can and do engage in which allow them to become integral elements of the compensatory program.

(2) Too many councils (in Massachusetts and elsewhere) can still be characterized by limited, indirect involvement and are capable of doing better.

(3) A validation process would bring educators and parents face to face with substantiating data about practices and strategies which will make the difference between an acceptable project and an exemplary one.

The "special consideration" given in the development of the Parent Advisory Council validation process was to <u>not</u> attempt to correlate parent council activity and student achievement. Instead, the process was designed on the basis of observable indicators which imply consistent interaction of the council with the dynamics of the educational enterprise. In considering the relative success of the council there had to be convincing evidence that their <u>particular</u> activities (1) increased parent participation in Title I activities and (2) provided parents with capabilities specifically relevant to participation on Title I advisory councils and involvement in their children's education.

Section V

Transferring Success and Future Implications

One of the major purposes of validating a program or practice is the transference of its success to other schools having needs similar to those that the validated project has served and continues to serve. Unless a program that is validated can have the opportunity to demonstrate its effectiveness for the benefit of other interested educators, the real purpose is lost.

Many strategies are available to generate information about the validated programs and components. Two documents, Exemplary Title I Programs In Massachusetts and Exemplary Title I Parent Advisory Councils in Massachusetts provide descriptions of the program or practices. Overview brochures are available free upon request. In addition, awareness presentations will be a major feature at state-wide conference and local workshop events. The state department of education and Title I staff will undoubtedly extend their efforts to have the validated projects made known.

Individuals interested in seeking program information, advice and/or assistance are encouraged to contact their Title I education specialist, project directors of the validated programs, or the state Title I evaluator. Such help may include telephone conversations, letters, workshops or special visits.

Interested parties may also contact the Title I Technical Assistance Center, or the Title I Dissemination Project.*

All of this generates a new dimension for technical assistance and dissemination activities currently provided by the Title I office. The challenges ahead include the task of continuing to validate and to disseminate information to local schools concerning educational practices which are effective.

Issues that need to be addressed as the process is refined are listed on the following page. Hopefully, this list will help stimulate discussion and feedback to assist us all in maintaining a quality process.

* see appendix J for the contact person

The following list of questions were selected to depict the nature of concerns of those involved in the development and installation of the Title I validation process.

* Once a program or practice is validated how long should it be considered "validated"?

* Is the composition of the validation team right for the purpose of collecting objective data?

* Who should lead the validation team?
  (a) the education specialist (supervisor of the project visited)
  (b) an outside expert

* Who should write the Validation Report?

* Should validation team members be paid for their contribution? How much?

* Should local Title I programs nominate themselves for validation or should they be nominated by their regional supervisors?

* Should the Dissemination Advisory Council review the validation team's report?

* Should the program be validated solely on the judgement of the on-site team?

* Does every member of the validation team have to accept the findings to make it validated? Can there be dissenting opinions?

* What if there are flaws within the validation team's report?

* Will local projects tend to support the development of new products and practices which appear to have a higher potential for validation?

* Will projects with potentially effective products or practices feel constrained by focusing on easily measured outcomes and traditional evaluation design?

* Will adopter/adapter projects pursue validation? Should they?

* Should validated projects receive additional money for dissemination? If yes, where should these funds come from?

Appendix A

MASSACHUSETTS TITLE I

VALIDATION, DESCRIPTION AND DISSEMINATION

OF EFFECTIVE PROJECTS

1979

Cognitive Impact Verification (Form A)

(Outline and Sample Page)

This form was completed by the project director and staff <u>before</u> the on-site validation visit.

A. Validity of Achievement Testing

1. test measures instructional objectives
2. same form and level used during pre and posttesting
3. functional level testing used
4. pre and posttesting done near beginning and end of project

B. Standardized Test Administration

1. test administrators trained
2. test conditions supported "best effort"

C. Sound Normative Basis for Score Interpretation

1. test administered near norming dates
2. percentiles based on national norms

D. Test Score Processing and Analysis Accuracy

1. tests scored correctly
2. raw scores converted to standard scores before averaging
3. only pre-post score pairs included in analysis
4. percentile conversions done correctly
5. out-of-level conversions done correctly
6. checks for accuracy made at all stages

E. Spurious Causes of Cognitive Growth

1. separate tests used for selection and pretesting
2. test scores available for most of students
3. testing conditions similar during pre and posttest

A. Please summarize in the briefest manner possible any evidence that the achievement test used to measure cognitive growth for program evaluation was valid. Please do so by citing evidence that supports each type of claim stated below.

CLAIM A1: The test score used to measure the cognitive growth of students for program evaluation contains items which measure a sufficient proportion of the program's instructional objectives or content.

EVIDENCE FOR A1:

CLAIM 2A: The same form and level of this test was used for both pre- and post-testing.

OR

Different levels of the test were used for pre-and post-testing because there would have been a floor effect (test would be too difficult) at pre-testing or there would have been a ceiling effect (test would be too easy) at post-testing.

EVIDENCE FOR A2:

Appendix B

MASSACHUSETTS TITLE I

VALIDATION, DESCRIPTION AND DISSEMINATION

OF EFFECTIVE PROJECTS

1979

Cognitive Impact Verification (Form B)

(Outline and Sample Page)

This form was completed by the on-site validation team <u>during</u> its visit to the project.

33

A. Validity of Achievement Testing

1. test measures instructional objectives
2. same form and level used during pre and posttesting
3. functional level testing used
4. pre and posttesting done near beginning and end of project

B. Standardized Test Administration

1. test administrators trained
2. test conditions supported "best effort"

C. Sound Normative Basis for Score Interpretation

1. test administered near norming dates
2. percentiles based on national norms

D. Test Score Processing and Analysis Accuracy

1. tests scored correctly
2. raw scores converted to standard scores before averaging
3. only pre-post score pairs included in analysis
4. percentile conversions done correctly
5. out-of-level conversions done correctly
6. checks for accuracy made at all stages

E. Spurious Causes of Cognitive Growth

1. separate tests used for selection and pretesting
2. test scores available for most of students
3. testing conditions similar during pre and posttest

A. Is there sufficient evidence that the achievement test used to measure cognitive growth for program evaluation was valid?

CLAIM A1: The test score used to measure the cognitive growth of students for program evaluation contains items which measure a sufficient proportion of the program's instructional objectives or content.

EVIDENCE FOR A1:

The evidence is ☐ accurate ☐ not accurate ☐ cannot decide

The evidence is ☐ adequate ☐ not adequate ☐ cannot decide

COMMENTS:

CLAIM 2A: The same form and level of this test was used for both pre-and post-testing.

OR

Different levels of the test were used for pre- and post-testing because there would have been a floor effect (test would be too difficult) at pre-testing or there would have been a ceiling effect (test would be too easy) at post-testing.

EVIDENCE FOR A2:

The evidence is ☐ accurate ☐ not accurate ☐ cannot decide

The evidence is ☐ adequate ☐ not adequate ☐ cannot decide

COMMENTS:

Appendix C

MASSACHUSETTS TITLE I
VALIDATION, DESCRIPTION AND DISSEMINATION
OF EFFECTIVE PROJECTS
1979

Project Description Report

(Outline)

This form was completed by the project director and staff before the on-site validation visit.

1. Target Audience
2. Student Selection
3. Major Project Goal(s)
4. Instructional Approach(es)
    a. content analysis of the curriculum
    b. classroom organization
    c. teaching techniques
    d. planning/managing instruction
    e. motivating students
    f. materials, equipment, supplies and/or facilities
    g. scheduling
5. Project Management and Organization
    a. staff organization
    b. project director responsibilities
    c. non-project personnel involvement
    d. other project staff roles
    e. staff development activities
    f. parent and community involvement
6. Special One-time Start-up Items
7. Evaluation Procedures

Appendix D

MASSACHUSETTS TITLE I

VALIDATION, DESCRIPTION AND DISSEMINATION

OF EFFECTIVE PROJECTS

1979

Observable Project Features Worksheet

This form was completed by the on-site validation team <u>during</u> its visit to the project.

Project Components/Features	Observable Indicators	Comments

Appendix E

MASSACHUSETTS TITLE I

VALIDATION OF EFFECTIVE PARENT ADVISORY COUNCILS

1979

Parent Involvement Checklist
(outline)

This questionnaire was completed by the PAC Chairperson, members and coordinator before the on-site validation visit. Its return had to be accompanied by examples of performance, e.g., sample meeting agendae, election materials, exhibits of recommendations and decisions.

PAC = both: District Parent Advisory Council (DAC)
School Parent Advisory Council (SAC)

1. How often do the PACs meet?

2. Who determines the schedule, location and agenda of the meetings?

3. Who notifies the PAC members of meetings?

4. Are PAC minutes recorded for each meeting?

5. Have the PACs established goals and objectives?

6. Have goals/objectives been acheived by the PACs?

7. Have the PACs held meetings which include some or all of the following: school committee persons, superintendent, principals, teachers, regional supervisors, guest speakers?

8. Do the PACs have written bylaws?

9. Is parent participation at the PAC meetings at least
51% ____ 80% ____ 100% ____ of the eligible parents?

10. If a school in your district has 75 or more students is the SAC composed of not less than 8 members?

11. Does the composition of the PAC meetings reflect at least 51% of the parents of children being served?

12. Is the DAC representative of all Title I schools receiving services?

13. Were all PAC members elected by the parents?
Do all members of each PAC have a membership roster?

14. Are the PACs involved with community agencies such as Community Action Organization, Citizens Resource Center, CETA?
How is each involved?

15. Has the LEA provided information, training and technical assistance for PAC members?
Were the PACs involved in planning the training program?
How was the information presented?

16. Have PAC members participated in regional and national conferences?
Who selects participants to attend?

17. Does the project budget contain provision for all PAC (DAC-SAC) expenses?

41

18. What are the DAC's guidelines/policy for determining budget line items and/or budget priorities?

19. How have the PACs been involved in identifying the needs of educationally deprived children?

20. How have the PACs been involved in the method of selecting participants in target schools?

21. How have the PACs been involved in establishing or reviewing the list of educational priorities?

22. How have the PACs been involved in determining program content?

23. How have the PACs been involved in the evaluation of the local Title I program?

24. How have the PACs been involved in the needs assessment?

25. How have the PACs been involved in the project's application?

26. Who presented material on evaluation to the councils?
Did the councils present any suggestions for change in future programs?
Were they implemented?

27. Have the PACs developed a monitoring form?

28. Did the PACs make at least one formal monitoring visit a year?
Did they make recommendations?
Were they acted upon?
Were any other program visits/observations made?

29. What dissemination activities are the PACs providing?

30. What PAC subcommittees have been established and is there evidence of their written reports on at least ¼ of the council's meeting agendae?

31. Do the PACs have a complaint procedure?

32. Have the PACs developed a self-evaluation instrument?

Appendix F

MASSACHUSETTS TITLE I

VALIDATION OF EFFECTIVE PARENT ADVISORY COUNCILS

1979

Parent Advisory Council Validation Interview Worksheet

This form was completed <u>during</u> the on-site validation visit.

Parent Advisory Council Component
Validation Visit

QUESTION _____

_____

TEAM MEMBERS' COMMENTS _____

_____

_____

QUESTION _____

_____

TEAM MEMBERS' COMMENTS _____

_____

_____

QUESTION _____

_____

TEAM MEMBERS' COMMENTS _____

_____

_____

QUESTION _____

_____

TEAM MEMBERS' COMMENTS _____

_____

_____

Appendix G

Sample Format for the Validation Report

I. Project title/program area

II. Location

III. Project director

IV. Source and level of funding

V. Program start date

VI. Brief description of project or practice

* goals and objectives
* context (community, school, student characteristics)
* grade levels, years in operation, size
* curricula, materials, staffing, facilities
* time involved, parent involvement, training

VII. Evidence of effectiveness

Appendix H

Thirteen Massachusetts Validated Title I Projects, 1979

AYER	"We Make the Difference III" Reading and Math, Grades 2-6
BRIDGEWATER	"Individualized and Small Group Instruction to Meet the Academic Needs in Reading and Math" Reading and Math, Grades 2-4
BROOKLINE	"ETC - Enriching the Curriculum" Reading - Grades 2-5; Math - Grades 3-6
DIGHTON	"Project ZAP" Reading, Grades 2-5
EVERETT	"PRIME - Program in Reading Improvement and Math Efficiency" Reading and Math, Grades 2-6
FRAMINGHAM	"Extra Chance" Reading, Grades K-8
GLOUCESTER	"Supportive Reading and Math" Reading, Grades 3-9
GREENFIELD	"Alleviate Remedial Reading and Mathematics Problems" Reading, Grades 3-6
MEDFORD	"LEAP - Language Education Acceleration Program" Reading, Grades 2-4
PEMBROKE	"Project Intensified Reading Service" Reading, Grades 2-4
TAUNTON	"Project RAM - Targeting Reading and Math" Reading, Grades 2-8
UXBRIDGE	"SMART - Success Equals Math and Reading Tactics" Reading and Math, Grades 2-8
WEBSTER	"Find and Save" Remedial Reading and Math, Grades 1-4

Appendix I

Massachusetts Validated Title I Parent Advisory Councils, 1979

FALL RIVER

LOWELL

NEW BEDFORD

PEABODY

47

Appendix J

Members of the Massachusetts Dissemination Advisory Council (1978-1979)

Cecilia DiBella, Project Director
NIE Dissemination Project

Evan Flamer, Jr., Federal Coordinator
Lynn Public Schools

Nicholas Hondrogen, Director of Dissemination
USOE Regional Office, Boston

Sandi Lambert, Project Director
Title I Dissemination Project

David Max McConkey, Director
The Network

Allen Schenck, Senior Research Associate
Title I Technical Assistance Center

Trudy Smith
State Parent Advisory Council, Boston

Richard Zusman, Evaluation Specialist
Massachusetts Title I Office

Appendix K

Members of the Parents Subcommittee who Helped Develop the Parent Involvement Checklist

Claire Anderson, Parent Information Coordinator
Title I Dissemination Project

Robert Galeaz
State Parent Advisory Council, Lynn

Patricia Inangelo, Parent Coordinator
Worcester

Rosa Landers
State Parent Advisory Council, Boston

Blair McCracken, Assistant to State Title I Director
Massachusetts Title I Office

Barbara McKenna, Parent Advisory Council Member
Attleboro

Cecilia Picard, Chairperson, District Committee
State Parent Advisory Council

Cleo Trammel
State Parent Advisory Council, Boston

Appendix L

On-Site Validation Team Members

I. Team Evaluators

James Adair, Research Assistant
Newton

Robert Consalvo, Executive Director
Public Affairs Research Institute

Dennis Laabs, Evaluator, Ed. Consultant

William LeBlanc, Evaluation Coordinator
Fall River Public Schools

Liasanio Orlandi, President
Public Affairs Research Institute

Cheryl Phillips, Supervisor, Evaluator
Springfield Public Schools

Nicholas Rubino, Management Information Services
Boston Public Schools

Louis Perullo, Management Information Services
Boston Public Schools

II. Curriculum Specialists

Mitchell Afrow, Reading Coordinator, Director Right to Read
Peabody Public Schools

John Carroll, Reading Coordinator/Title I Director and Basic Skills Coordinator
Abington Public Schools

Mary Gilmore, Director, Right to Read
Winchendon Public Schools

On-Site Validation Team Members

II. Curriculum Specialists (continued)

Peter Ingeneri, District 8 Community Superintendent
Boston Public Schools

Ruth Jarvis, Title I Director
North Reading Public Schools

John Kelley, Math Specialist
Brockton Public Schools

Raymond Mathews, Reading Coordinator
Bourne Right to Read

Marianne McAllister, Director, Right to Read; Director, Project Interserv
Attleboro Public Schools

Rita McNally, Director
Stoughton Right to Read

Edith Morgan, Title I Director, Right to Read Director
Quabbin Regional Schools

Von Orton, Title I Director
Milton Public Schools

Carol Painter, Reading Specialist
Stow Public Schools

Alicia Paulson, Math Teacher, Title I
Billerica Public Schools

Robert Russell, Math Coordinator
Boston Public Schools

Zita Salvensen, Reading Program Lead Teacher
Somerville Public Schools

Norma Simard, Title I Director
Chelmsford Public Schools

Laurie Slobody, Director of Reading
Arlington Public Schools

Raymond Whipple, Math Department Head
North Reading Public Schools

On-Site Validation Team Members

III. Title I Project Directors

Raymond Brodeur, Arlington

Richard Buckley, Brockton

Thomas Delmonaco, Pembroke

Christopher Gregory, Kingston Cooperative

Ellen McCarthy, Woburn

Marilyn Randall, Adams-Cheshire Regional

IV. Regional Supervisors, Title I, Massachusetts Department of Education

Susan Adler, Education Specialist
Southeast Regional Center

Joseph Bodanza, Education Specialist
Central Massachusetts Regional Center

Richard Carbone, Education Specialist
Greater Boston Regional Center

Ardith Crampton, Education Specialist
Greater Boston Regional Center

Margaret Droney, Education Specialist
Northeast Regional Center

Blanche Frith, Education Specialist
Greater Boston Regional Center

Barbara King, Education Specialist
Central Massachusetts Regional Center

Shirley Roberts, Education Specialist
Greater Boston Regional Center

Eva Thanos, Education Specialist
Northeast Regional Center

On-Site Validation Team Members

IV. Regional Supervisors, Title I, Massachusetts Department of Education (continued)

Clare Walsh, Education Specialist
Southeast Regional Center

Sheila White, Education Specialist
Pittsfield Regional Center

Timothy Wilson, Education Specialist
Central Massachusetts Regional Center

V. Parents

Dorothy Doherty, PAC Coordinator
Arlington

Barbara McKenna, PAC member
Attleboro

Carol McKelvey, PAC Coordinator
Marlboro

Alice Pagliarulo, PAC Chairperson
Revere

Ralph Pirozzi, PAC member
Arlington

Linda Smith, Parent Advisory Liaison
Brockton

Marie Treggiari, Parent Advisory Liaison
Brockton

Bailie Weiss, Parent Coordinator
Malden

Bibliography

Educational Programs That Work. 5th edition. United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Prepared by: the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, San Francisco, Fall, 1978.

Educational Programs That Work. Prepared by: Lillian White-Stevens, Ph.D., Division of School Program, Department of Education, State of New Jersey, 225 West State Street, Trenton, New Jersey, 08625, January, 1977.

Massachusetts Validation Process. Massachusetts Department of Education. Developed by: Massachusetts Department of Education, ESEA, Title IV-C Staff with Hampshire Educational Collaborative Title IV Development Center, Spring, 1979.

The Joint Dissemination Review Panel IDEABOOK. U.S. Office of Education and the National Institute of Education, and U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. By: G. Kasten Tallmadge, RMC Research Corporation, Mountain View, California, October, 1977.

The IVD Process -- Myths and Facts Relevant to Prospective Policy Directions For Exemplary Educational Programs Replication: NASAC Study of the USOE "Identification, Validation, Dissemination (IVD) Process." Executive Summary. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, U.S. Office of Education, Office of Evaluation and Dissemination, Division of Educational Replication. Submitted by: National Association of State Advisory Councils, NASAC-IVD Project, 111 Bow Street, Portsmouth, New Hampshire, February 2, 1979.

Title I ESEA, Educational Programs That Work. Basic Skills in Reading/Mathematics, Early Childhood. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1978.

Transferring Success. U.S. Office of Education's NATIONAL DIFFUSION NETWORK. Prepared by: the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, San Francisco, March, 1976.

Transferring Successful Practices. A Manual for the Validation of Educational Products and Processes. The University of the State of New York, The State Education Department, Division of ESC General Program Planning, Albany, New York, 12234, 1976.

Sharing Educational Success. A Handbook for Validation of Educational Practices. United States Office of Education, National Advisory Council on Supplementary Centers and Services, National Association of State Advisory Council Chairmen, State Department of Education, June, 1977.